

REMARKS

In the Action mailed December 1, 2006, all pending claims 1-22 were rejected. In the amendments above, Applicants have amended claims 1, 10 and 19. As such, claims 1-22 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the following remarks. In addition, Applicants request that the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement being filed on even date be considered.

Statement regarding common ownership of Kaiser reference

With respect to the Kaiser reference (US Publication 2005/0010606), Applicants submit that Kaiser is, and was at the time of the present invention, subject to assignment to the same assignee, SAP Aktiengesellschaft (that is, SAP AG). As such, 35 U.S.C. 103(c) forbids Kaiser from being usable as a reference to contend that Applicants' claims are obvious.

Applicants note that although the PTO assignment database shows two recorded assignments for the Kaiser reference, the only correct assignment recordation is the recordation of SAP Aktiengesellschaft. Applicants attach, for the Examiner's convenience, a copy of the assignment in the Kaiser application, U.S. Application Serial No. 10/617,141 (the Kaiser reference). This assignment document shows the assignee as SAP Aktiengesellschaft. The assignment document was originally erroneously recorded with SAP Global Intellectual Property indicated as the assignee, but that was later corrected to indicate SAP Aktiengesellschaft as the correct assignee.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that any rejection based on the Kaiser reference be removed, and that the statement above complies with MPEP 706.02(l)(1) I), in order to remove the Kaiser reference as a reference against the present claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 101

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims are allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. While Applicants do not agree with the rejection, in order to advance prosecution on the merits, Applicants have addressed the concerns raised in the Action as to each of claims 1, 10 and 18. Applicants amendment is being made without prejudice.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 101 rejection of claims 1-22 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance, and requests that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance. In addition, Applicants request that the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement being filed on even date be considered.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Examiner is authorized to charge \$1020 to Deposit Account No. 06-1050 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 1, 2007



Stephen R. Schaefer
Reg. No. 37,927

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696